

BEST COPY
AVAILABLE

5 August 1958

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-0

FOIAb3b

SUMMIT CONFERENCE AND THE MIDDLE EAST

It is difficult to see how President Eisenhower can avoid—to the credit of himself and the United States—a summit conference. Apparently, most of our allies want this conference, the neutral world wants it and most of the Afro-Asian nations want it. If the President did not wish it and does not wish it, it would have been far better for him months ago to have negated the idea firmly and absolutely. He was always indecisive and woolly in his answers to the many nasty letters Khrushchev wrote. It looks now as if he will be ushered into a conference he does not want, a conference that may be a personal triumph, unfortunately, for Khrushchev, whose stock will skyrocket in Europe and in Asia, while Eisenhower's stature has been greatly reduced in the eyes of the neutral world. I say this reluctantly. He should have been advised to veto a summit conference months ago, in no uncertain language, but once he said he would climb to the summit, he could not decline and descend.

If and when a conference is held, we must get somebody to match the cunning and battle wit of Khrushchev. Make no mistake about it, despicable as he is, he has a dynamic personality and he gives us a homely proverbial barbed quotations from Russian folklores. Neither Dulles, with his legalistic, negative attitude, nor the President, with his formal, indecisive manner, would be a match for Khrushchev. I say this is all kindness to the President. There is only one man that I know of on the American scene that could meet Khrushchev and worst him: another him with satire, deluge him with witticisms and interlard his oratory with abusive anecdotes—that man is A. J. Stevenson—who, in addition to all these qualifications, has an overpowering ability and a mastery of history and geography. Khrushchev would find no equal in Asia. Why do not the President and Dulles call upon him, may be, why not the President and Dulles call upon our Presidents Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman, and former Secretary of State Dean Acheson? These are all wisdom doesn't reside in the administration. Perhaps these men could lend considerable support to Dulles and Eisenhower and prevent embarrassment.

Our trouble is our lack of a policy. There is an ad hoc approach, a day to day. We always seem to do things reluctantly, as though we do not want them—as when Prime Minister Churchill forced our hand to consent to the meeting. Why do we always seem so negative and so unconcerned about the appearance we may create in the eyes of the world? We should insist and keep on insisting to all the distributors of Khrushchev that we want peace, but that he, Khrushchev, hampers peace. Frankly, some of the letters that Khrushchev wrote were so foul and so vindictive and so full of abuse that diplomatic practice should have prevailed and the letters should have been returned unanswered to the Russian Ambassador. Heretofore, in previous administrations, when any nation practically insulted our head of State, the nation that sent such a letter got short shrift. That has not been the case these days with the present administration and that is unfortunate.

As to the Middle East, our policy should be clearcut and unmistakable. It should call for the following:

1. Settlement of the Arab refugee problem.
2. A Middle East arms embargo.

3. Withdrawal by Russia of its Council veto of the United Nations resources plan for the Middle East.

4. Guarantee of the integrity of the borders of and sovereignty of Israel and the Arab States.

5. Prevention of not only armed aggression from without, but prevention of indirect aggression by infiltration and propaganda.

6. Free access of the West to eastern oil reserves.

7. Recognition of Arab nationalism, but insistence that it be for peace and not for aggression, and divorced from Soviet influence.

We hear little these days of the Eisenhower doctrine. Its tones are painfully silent. It came in with a bang and went out with a whimper. Where was the great bluff and flourish that ushered it in? It has not been a signal success and cost us over \$300 million. That money has gone down the drain. Do you remember the Richards' mission? Former Congressman Richards was sent to the Middle East with a bundle of \$300 million, which he distributed among the Arab countries. What did we get for this \$300 million? The guns he purchased, apparently have been turned against us. Strange too, that little Israel, that did not participate in this booty, is the only country in the area upon which we can safely count.

Incidentally, Israeli intelligence gave advance notice to both London and Washington of the coup d'état in Iraq that shattered the Middle East peace. But Magellan and Dulles ignored the warning. What a time they had better listen to little Israel.

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-0049R000100730004-0